

The Sun

SUNDAY, MARCH 26, 1916.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	50 00
DAILY, Per Year	5 00
SUNDAY, Per Month	25 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 50
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	10 00
FOREIGN RATES	
DAILY, Per Month	1 50
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	1 50

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 100 N. 10th St., New York, N. Y. President and Treasurer, William C. Rhea, 150 Nassau St., New York. Editor, Edward P. Mitchell, 150 Nassau St., New York. Secretary, C. E. Litchell, 150 Nassau St., New York.

All checks, money orders, and bills to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 100 N. 10th St., New York, N. Y. President and Treasurer, William C. Rhea, 150 Nassau St., New York. Editor, Edward P. Mitchell, 150 Nassau St., New York. Secretary, C. E. Litchell, 150 Nassau St., New York.

If our friends who favor us with money orders and checks should return them they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

See About Mexico.

The President and his advisers are justly indignant at the malicious misrepresentation of the object of this country in its pursuit of a bandit across the boundary line of Mexico. That misrepresentation is deliberate and inspired by a definite purpose. Its significance is not hidden, and if in the protection of the national interest its exposure becomes necessary, the task will not be difficult. Every man with eyes in his head has seen the engine of mischief in operation, and has recognized the source of its malevolent energy.

The distortions and falsehoods that comprise its most effective output are familiar in all their details. Wearing a slightly different dress they have frequently been put forward for the accomplishment of ends not less creditable, if they were of smaller magnitude, than those in whose behalf they are exercised to-day. The fountain from which they flow is not hidden, and the course in which they are led reveals the personalities that guide them.

That the lies of yesterday are regularly exposed to-day offers encouragement for the belief that their effect cannot be serious, for even the most glibly most occasionally choke over an uninterrupted diet of perversion and mendacity.

Interstellar Wireless.

That interstellar wireless communication may be a possibility of the future is a belief now held by not a few scientists, but it has remained for M. PRINCE GUZMAN of Paris, France, to stimulate the efforts of what may be called our astronomical telegraphers to get into touch with our planetary neighbors. M. GUZMAN has promised to pay \$20,000 to the astronomer who first establishes communication with any planet or star other than Mars.

M. GUZMAN's elimination of Mars as a wireless station in the competition he is promoting is based upon his belief that experiments made by American astronomers in Arizona prove that a wireless expert who talked with the Martians would be overpaid if he received 100,000 francs. This performance, to his mind, is too easy, too lacking in romantic and sensational features to be worthy of the modest fortune he has dedicated to science. It may be that M. GUZMAN considers the Martians merely an insignificant lot of chronic canal builders, whose conversation over an interstellar wireless apparatus would be of no interest to us.

To the average layman, nevertheless, it would appear that direct and authentic news from Mars might be of some value to us. The Martians appear to have solved various engineering problems that prove their ingenuity and technical skill in lines of endeavor in which we Americans are at present intensely interested. If the Martians have learned how to build canals without inviting land-slides, have made of irrigation processes an exact science, and have, as various authorities contend, learned how to fly by their own motive power, there are numberless specialists in this country who would be pleased to call them up by long distance at once. It is to be hoped that M. GUZMAN of Paris will revise his opinion of Mars as too easy a mark for wireless geniuses.

The Passing of the "Opera House."

Greensboro, N. C., has attained that estate midway between the village and the metropolis where it is debating the advisability of discarding the name of its Grand Opera House for an appellation having the word "theatre" at the end.

Strictly speaking only two classes of towns are entitled to the possession of "grand opera houses." Greensboro admits it is not yet of the first, those in which the institution literally justifies its name. Meanwhile it is proudly conscious of having outgrown the second class. With a population of 15,885 it may no longer be described as a tank town on the keystone circuit, a stranger to melodrama, in whose "opera house" the only approaches to harmony ever heard are polyphonic renditions given by the Bryans and the yodlers appear together; where "Ten Nights in a Bar Room" is the principal vehicle for the display of the histrionic abilities of wandering

thespians, doubling in brass at popular prices.

But Greensboro does well to approach the solution of its problem with calm deliberation. Without its "opera house" what would serve as the forum for the discussion of questions of serious moment in the life of the community, the arena for forensic contests between the local orators? Where would the K. P. and the Red Men hold their festivals on the "off" nights? Obviously such gatherings have no place in the "theatre." The "opera house" by any other name would fall far short of its manifold many-sided destiny.

Nor is the question without its sentimental side. There is something almost pathetic in the passing of the "opera house." Little Willie is never little Willie again once he has donned his first pair of knickerbockers.

Trade After the War.

When LLOYD GEORGE, discussing the post-bellum economic policy to be adopted by the Allies, declared that "When we consider trade, the first thing to be done is to obliterate any idea of revenge," the voice of the sober British business sense was heard. It is a voice of renaissance raised in a time of disturbing clamor and an earnest of the prevalence of cooler counsels when the angers of to-day subside.

Allies and Tontons have been threatening an economic war as soon as the men are out of the trenches. All kinds of schemes are being discussed to keep what is now called enemy trade out of home markets and to try to keep it out of neutral markets. The least menace offered is a refusal to trade with each other. What are the probabilities in the light of experience and necessity?

The warring nations will do all the harm to one another that they can while the war lasts. After the war resumption of commerce and financial relations between the present enemies may be slow and at first unprofitable. Yet such is the nature of man and such the laws of economic life that no artificial barriers can long obstruct the natural course of commerce and finance through the channels of international exchange.

When peace comes things will look different to the belligerents and to the neutrals. The men who will be heeded will be business and not military statesmen. Current programmes of trade and commercial conflict are projected in the heat and passion of the contest. Vision and thought are disorderly, but it is encouraging that a voice like LLOYD GEORGE's should already be raised in Great Britain directing attention to the facts of the future, and that similar utterances have been made in Germany and France.

The fact of the future is that in the task of repairing war's ravages and reconstructing the shattered organization of civilization the belligerents will need all the trade that they can develop. Plenty of competition there will be, but trade development will be assisted if the competition is of the kind which seeks first to make trade and commerce profitable to all. Tendencies are all that can be safely discussed to-day, but the commercial tendency after the war will probably be away from the warlike forms of competition and toward the manner of rivalry that obtained before the conflict.

Novel Writing at Three Score and Nineteen.

That irrepressible youngster WILLIAM DEAN HOWELLS, by way of celebrating his seventy-ninth birthday anniversary, has just begun the serial publication in the April Century of his new novel, "The Leatherstocking." Its scenes are laid in the middle West, in what formerly was known as the Western Reserve, where HOWELLS spent his boyhood; and the time of action is that of his own youth, the period when impressions are strongest.

The story opens with a swing and a dash which quickly develop a situation of dramatic intensity. No need is there to mention the charm, the finished grace, with which the opening chapters are written; the flashes of wit, the azure humor felt as an atmospheric condition rather than perceived through intellectual process; or the keen, unerring characterization sharply defined and wholly authentic. Not even from a master of creative literary art could readers have been justified in demanding such a revelation of the play and interplay of indistinguishable elemental forces as is laid before them in the first installment of "The Leatherstocking."

For more than half a hundred years novels, poems, short stories, essays; books of travel and observation; volumes of biography, criticism, psychological studies and personal reminiscences have flowed steadily and surely from a reservoir apparently inexhaustible. A generation ago Mr. HOWELLS was writing a series of acting comedies—he modestly termed them "farces"—which, because of delicate achievement, alone would have given their author enviable literary distinction. Yet to-day "The Sleeping Car" and "The Mouse Trap" and others of that series are being played by amateur actors all over the land, to their vast satisfaction and to the enjoyment of their audiences. For more than fifty years Mr. HOWELLS has steadily traversed the alluring highway of authorship, refusing to turn aside, refusing to lower his standards of literary art. His work builds large and substantial. Seventy titles are to his credit—and not a

line, a shade of thought, not so much as an innuendo, to his discredit. But this is aside from the fact that now, at the age of 70, Mr. HOWELLS is publishing "The Leatherstocking." The Century wisely gives first place to it in the current number. It is a literary incident of importance.

An interesting connection in connection with "The Leatherstocking" indicates something of its author's systematic, careful, businesslike habits. On the very day when tentative proposals were made as to magazine publication Mr. HOWELLS, in going over some old letters, came across a note written to him exactly twenty-six years previous by the late ROSS SMITH, founder of the Century. At the time Mr. HOWELLS had just entered an agreement with Harper & Brothers whereby that firm was to have exclusive publishing rights in his future work; and Mr. SMITH wrote him a congratulatory note, in which he also expressed sincere regret that the Century thus was losing such a valuable contributor. He added that if the time again should come when Mr. HOWELLS felt free to publish elsewhere than in Franklin Square the Century would always have a hearty welcome for whatever he might care to offer it.

Since that time was written, in the long ago, ROSS SMITH has passed away, and FRANK SCOTT, GILDER, CHESTER and DRAKE. Of all the remarkable men who constituted the soul and heart and intellect of the Century, who made it a power in life and literature and art, WILLIAM W. ELLSWORTH alone remains in active control, if our understanding is correct. But the magazine itself goes on with undiminished spirit, unfailing integrity of purpose and unswerving influence. Likewise the youngest of its oldest contributors goes on his way—the way of seasoned and matured authorship; blithe and gay, unobtrusively philosophical, respectfully dramatic, filled to overflowing with friendliness for all the world.

The Summer of a Hundred Years Ago.

In these parts there seems to be a feeling of resentment against the hibernating groundhog because he proved to be a false prophet when he hibernated from his winter home on February 2 to take a weather observation. Artemus monax not seeing a shadow of himself returned to his soggery for a brief stay, confident that spring would soon come up from the south. So tradition had it. Forthwith winter began to rage with blizzards and bitter cold, storm upon storm and rude blasts unintermittent, day after day and week after week, until it seemed that when the season changed it must be from winter to summer, with spring lost in the shuffle. But the groundhog was right after all. He went back into his hole prepared to stand a long siege of wintry weather. It was leap year, and an old calendar has it:

"If cloudy Christmas day in leap year be, And the woodchuck his shadow cannot see,

Back to his ground hole he goes to stay, For winter will last till All Fools' day."

This in justification of the groundhog or woodchuck. As a weather prophet his reputation has really been enhanced. But what we should like to know is whether the arctic year of 1816 is to be repeated in 1916. Unfortunately the groundhog cannot enlighten us, although his interest in the matter is paramount. A vegetarian, rationed would be hard to find if there were to be no summer in 1916. Twenty years ago THE SUN published an interview with an aged man, JAMES WINCHESTER, who was 74 years old when his native State of Vermont was devastated by snowstorms in the summer of the year after Waterloo saw NAPOLEON's star go down in blackest night and peace return to war-wasted Europe. The whole year of 1816, with brief intervals of tepidity, was cold and cheerless. On June 17 snow fell to a depth of ten inches in Vermont, and in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania it was three inches deep. "That storm of June 17," said JAMES WINCHESTER, "was one of the severest I ever saw, even in the depth of winter. In that locality of severe snows." A wind, bitter cold, came out of the north and piled the snow in deep drifts. An uncle of JAMES WINCHESTER who sullied out in the whirl of fakes to herd some sheep in a distant pasture lost his way, and three days afterward a searching party found him dead in a great drift. There was no summer that year. Describing the terrible season, Mr. WINCHESTER said:

"The wind during June, July and August of 1816 was continuously from the north and it blew fiercely and cold. Farmers wore heavy overcoats and mittens while about their work every day during those months. There was little use of planting anything; nothing grew to speak of, but they did plant corn as usual and planted with melons on . . . July was colder even than June, and August was colder than July. Ice half an inch thick formed in July, but in August it froze an inch and more. There was a heavy snowstorm on August 20. The whole summer was bleak and dreary as November. There was not a green thing to be seen anywhere."

How did the woodchuck take out a substance? How did one keep warm? As a matter of fact, everybody was miserable and many were gripped by superstition. Had the sun lost its power, and was the end of the world coming? JAMES GOODWIN,

a Vermont farmer, thought so. In the belief that freezing and starvation was to be the fate of all living creatures, he humbly killed his cattle and hanged himself in the barn, after urging Mrs. GOODWIN to follow his example. There was a little warmth the first fortnight in September. The mercury in the tube crept up to 70 degrees, but in the middle of the month wintry conditions returned, and there was no more relief. The crops were, of course, a failure. A terrible year!

But there has been nothing like it in this part of the world since—that is to say, no long protracted and crop-killing cold on such a scale. New England has had its "Dark Days," when pious old women and fearful old men miserably stood, so they thought, in the shadow of the Last Judgment; but the Arctic Circle has not dropped down to the latitude of Bennington. Why should the snows and bitter colds of 1816 recur a hundred years later? There is the coincidence of an era of war and desolation in Europe, but the parallel is not complete in that we have not seen the end of ours. It cannot be left to the groundhog, dependable prophet as he is, though his reemergence might hold a portent.

Senator Underwood had indicated to Senator Myers of Montana that he would not object to the immediate consideration of the Ferris water power bill, which had done so without having knowledge of the important facts that the Senator in charge of the rural credits bill, Hollis of New Hampshire, was ready to proceed with that measure, and that a majority of the Rocky Mountain States Senators were opposed to the Ferris bill. He faced a typical situation, a situation making for delay.

Why Not Mayor Lillian?

MISS LILLIAN RUSSELL is "mentioned" by a Pittsburgh newspaper as a possible candidate for Mayor. She says she doesn't really want the job, but admits that the germ is in her blood, and her recital of the circumstances under which her mother, Mrs. CYNTHIA LEONARD, entered the Mayoralty race in New York in 1888 "may be regarded as significant," as the political reporters say:

"I feel like my mother felt when a newspaper reporter asked her if she would run for Mayor of New York."

"Who would nominate me?" mother laughed.

"I will nominate you," cried the reporter. And he did, and she really ran."

Anyway, Miss Russell has a platform. "I should like to feel," she says, "that the streets were literally clean enough not to soil any woman's skirts." Such a plank should make a strong appeal in any town, even though most women have found a way to keep their skirts well off the pavements.

But if the Smoky City is too hardened to seize the opportunity, it may be well to suggest to Miss Russell that any candidate running on a clean streets platform could certainly win in New York to-day.

An amendment to the Hay bill adopted last week gives control of the army to the President. With this power he may eventually get control of the majority in the House.

Greece is a little country. When big dogs fight it is no place for little dogs. —KING CONSTANTINE.

But the little dog can be on the right side if he seeks victory.

I am a candidate for delegate at large to the convention, but if any of my friends have any doubts as to my fitness for the office, let them send some one else to the convention.—WILLIAM J. BRYAN.

The implication is that Mr. BRYAN's campaign has been strong, steady and constant for WOODROW WILSON.—GEO. BLESSING.

New York has found a new street and calls it Rachel Lane. The "new" street has a couple of houses a century old. When they were younger Rachel Lane was Pig alley in Newark, N. J., the present Chancellor avenue used to be lot De Lane. Every city has monuments to the iconoclasm of "improvers," who had rather be proper than picturesque. History is written in names, and those who edit, for instance, the English post, take care to have their names in the New York directory are vandals.

Designation for the keynote speech will probably be delayed until those who "robbed me of my nomination" have decided what the key should be used to open this time—a flint or a frolic.

Presidential straw votes, merely show which way the wind blows.

Uncle JOE CANNON asserts that the so-called "first families" of this country are not in the first census. This is a matter that should be investigated at once by experts. The Colonial Dames and the Sons of Colonial Wars owe an immediate duty to themselves and their ancestors in the case CANNON vs. Blood.

There is a type of machine gun in politics that does its most effective work in the dark.

Ireland's Fatal Defect.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Edmund Spenser, the English poet, lived in Ireland in 1594 and wrote as follows regarding Ireland:

"There have been diverse good poets and wise counsellors who have advised reformation of that realm, but they say it is the fatal defect of that land that no purpose, whatsoever is meant for her good, will prosper at the good effect, which, whether it proceed from the very genius of the soil, or influence of the stars, or that Almighty God hath not yet appointed the time of her reformation, that He reserveth her in this unquiet state until for some secret scourge which shall be her come into England, it is hard to be known but yet much to be feared."

Pittsburgh, March 25. J. A. M. HING.

Making the Reading Like the Writing.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The New York newspapers are springing the most wonderful typographical combinations. They seem to be in variety and extent. I have quite worn out my dictionary in searching for strange new words met with in the news columns.

What is the matter with the compositors and proofreaders? "Broad speeches remain" in Shakespeare; an actress in "Catharine" usually, a railroad is to put a roof over its engine in variety and extent. In what language are our newspapers supposed to be printed? C. D. New York, March 26.

SENATORIAL COURTESY.

Mr. Underwood's Estimate of Its Bad Potentialities.

WASHINGTON, March 25.—Senator Underwood during his twenty years service in Congress has never been a seceder; his methods are calm, persuasive. This makes more significant the circumstances marking his first appearance in debate on the floor of the Senate, when he had been a member of that body a little more than a year. He lectured the Senate for not attending to his knitting and reminded his colleagues that their business at the time was, specifically and urgently, to knit.

Senator Myers was urging consideration of the so-called water power bill, known in the House, which had already passed it, as the Ferris bill. The Senate after a month's labor had recently passed a general dam bill. The Senate bill was intended to meet the requirements to be observed in the building of dams for power purposes in navigable streams; the Ferris bill made general provisions to be applied in the building of dams for power purposes in streams on public lands, and, those generally known as Rocky Mountain States.

Senator Underwood had indicated to Senator Myers of Montana that he would not object to the immediate consideration of the Ferris water power bill, which had done so without having knowledge of the important facts that the Senator in charge of the rural credits bill, Hollis of New Hampshire, was ready to proceed with that measure, and that a majority of the Rocky Mountain States Senators were opposed to the Ferris bill. He faced a typical situation, a situation making for delay.

Senator Underwood did not show any acerbity in voice or manner when he began to speak, but he held the instant of the Senators the instant he gravely announced that Senatorial courtesy was a thing of the past. He said that he would not object to the immediate consideration of the water power bill. He said: "A statement has been made in this debate which causes me to change my position in this matter."

He then went on to state that Senator Hollis was not prepared to take up the rural credits bill. That measure, he reminded his hearers, was important, had been before the Senate nearly three years, and he objected to laying it aside for consideration of one new bill within a week of the passage of another bill of similar importance. He then launched into his lecture, interrupted only by gasps of astonishment from old school members who had never before listened to such language in that body.

Mr. Underwood had been a member of the United States House of Representatives for more than two decades, and he had never seen the public business of the nation so far behind and so much delayed as it is to-day. He had been a member of the House for more than two decades, and he had never seen the public business of the nation so far behind and so much delayed as it is to-day. He had been a member of the House for more than two decades, and he had never seen the public business of the nation so far behind and so much delayed as it is to-day.

His re-election served him right; in three months the Senate after a mighty struggle, had passed three contested bills: Philippine Islands, an urgent deficiency bill, and the general dam bill. He pointed out further to his annoyed hearers that they yet had to consider in committee debate and pass foreign appropriation bills and revenue bills of great importance. Then he added:

It is evident that if we intend to increase the army and navy of this country it will be necessary to pass revenue bills to take care of the expanded army and navy. It is equally evident that if we become involved in difficulties in Mexico additional revenue will be necessary to take care of the affairs of the government. So far as these bills have so far been considered by the Senate. It has been pointed out to the effect that it will be necessary to pass bills increasing the army, providing for a reserve military force, and an increase of the naval establishment of the United States. If these bills have not yet been considered.

But the plea came too late; a bare majority of the Senators present had given to Senator Myers assurance that they would not obstruct immediate consideration of the water power bill, in reply was called, 56 Senators voted yes, 48 no and 28 were absent or paired.

It is thought, however, that Mr. Underwood's lecture will do some good. There were several Senators known to be opposed to wasting days in considering the water power bill, but they had yielded to senatorial courtesy. That attitude will probably be given less freely in the future, but "courtesy" has already developed a situation which, according to Mr. Underwood, keep Congress in session until the national election campaign is over way or result in the failure of most important legislation.

"OH GOD! OH MONTREAL!"

The Poem Is to Be Found in Samuel Butler's Note Books.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Mr. John Worthy will find Butler's "Psalm of Montreal" about the banishment of the Discobolus, in "The Note Books of Samuel Butler" (London, 1912) pages 28-30.

The poem was written in Canada in 1875. It was published in the Spectator on March 14, 1875, and was reprinted from Previous Works of Butler in 1884. PHILIP HALE.

A Crabbed Critic of the Jerseys.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Here is an advertisement that appeared in a newspaper of this town:

To HAVE A Farm of Acres and a house, running spring water in dairy and barn in abundance, stable for 18 cows, lake for ducks, room for four chickens. Seven room flat among the trees.

I have heard and seen many varieties of flats and had supposed that New York City had advanced in the line of flats than any other city of town, but I really think Bergenfield now deserves first prize.

Think of it, a seven room flat among the trees, to say nothing of a "barn in abundance!" D. WATT ENGLISH.

Bergenfield, N. J., March 25.

Nutley Rejoices.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I learn in THE SUN that "Nutty's name is now Nutley."

Glad some one appreciates the beauty of that name! NUTLEYVILLE.

Nutley, N. J., March 26.

ENGLAND'S WHEAT SUPPLY.

Her Needs Met by Crops of America, Argentina and Australia.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I read with interest Dr. Oberholzer's remarks about the straitened condition of wheat supply in England. I am sure how do not seem to get the same impression of the wheat supply conditions that he does. For instance, he cites the stocks of wheat in England at four English ports and shows that there were only 47,665 tons there in February, 1916, as compared with 164,911 tons in June, 1915. I have never before heard of wheat in tons, rather preference bushels or quarters, which are more commonly used as measures in the grain trade of England and this country. It is therefore necessary for me to convert the figures into this supply matter, to reduce his tons to bushels. Doing this I find that his supply in February, 1916, totals 1,583,823 bushels, as against 5,653,800 bushels in June, 1915.

The defect I find in these statistics is something similar to that once exposed by the late Mr. C. F. Johnson, in his "Cotton's Financial School," published back in 1876, where the stock of wheat in a few towns in Illinois was used to indicate the condition of the wheat supply in the United States. I would much prefer, as does the grain trade, I believe, generally, to take into consideration all the wheat in the country, and do with the quantity, and not the quality, which reveals the following figures:

	Feb. 1, 1916.	Feb. 1, 1915.	June 1, 1915.
U. K.	13,200,000	17,600,000	13,600,000
Adapt for . . .			
U. K.	11,110,000	9,170,000	12,900,000
Total	24,310,000	26,770,000	26,500,000

Thus we find that instead of the 1-583,823 bushels in four ports in February, 1916, we have 13,200,000 bushels in the United Kingdom, or over eight times as much. When it comes to the quantity of wheat in the United Kingdom we find a total of 24,310,000 bushels in or headed for England, say fifteen times as much as the four English ports. In other words, after a year of subsidizing the wheat in or headed for the United Kingdom is 8,000,000 bushels greater in quantity than it was when the "doctrine of righteousness" was first being applied.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered. The British Government, having approved the wheat and wheat freights, has possibly stayed out of the market just to bring about the slump in prices. I am sure Dr. Oberholzer will be pleased to know that the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's statistics were gathered.

As to prices being higher than a year ago, that is true, largely because Britain is more dependent on wheat and wheat freights to Europe are double those of a year ago. On the other hand, the price of wheat in the United States is 20 cents a bushel lower than when Dr. Oberholzer's